

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the new claims and the following remarks. In the Office action mailed April 13, 2004, clarification is sought for drawing sheets 1-152. Additionally, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Finally, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,743,063 to Boozer, U.S. Patent No. 4,796,403 to Fulton et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,563,849 to Mangal, and U.S. Patent No. 5,829,216 to Newcomb et al. Please reconsider the application along with applicant's request for continuing examination, in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Drawings

Applicant has cancelled drawing sheets with sheet numbering of 1-152, reserving the right to reinstate such drawing sheets.

Claims

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-26 without prejudice. Applicant also has added new claims 27-51 directed to building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion. The new claims are fully supported in the specification as originally filed. For example, page 1 of the specification indicates that the parts are preferably formed of an "extrusion-molded polymeric plastic material." Additionally, page 2 of the specification says:

Assembled slid/snapped-together parts, in relation to the kinds of configurations proposed for their associated connector elements according to the invention, are intentionally permitted certain limited ranges of angular and/or translational (in several directions) relative motion.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant believes that all of the new claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112. The concept of providing building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion is particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed in new claims 27-51.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-26 and added new claims 27-51 to clarify distinctions between the cited prior art and the claimed invention. Specifically, the new claims recite that the building components are extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion. That interlocking engagement allows the claimed invention to better accommodate externally applied loads and environmental temperature changes as compared to the cited prior art.

In Figures 2A, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 15 in Boozer, the Examiner points to slidable brackets. However, the slidable brackets in Boozer are formed of "sufficiently strong sheet metal" (col. 11, ln. 37). Additionally, the slidable brackets are connected by conventional fasteners, such as the sheet metal screw or bolt 85 shown in Figure 8C (col. 8, Ins. 50-53). Thus, Boozer fails to teach or suggest building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion.

In Figures 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in Fulton, the Examiner points to roofing panel clips. However, the clips in Fulton are formed of metal to support "standing seam metallic roofing panels" (col. 1, ln. 13). Additionally, the clips are connected by conventional fasteners, such as the rivets 66 shown in Figure 5 (col. 5, Ins. 28-30). Thus, Fulton fails to teach or suggest building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion.

In Mangal, the Examiner points to a device for interlocking two adjacent metal frames from different levels. However, the device in Mangal is formed of metal to interlock together "two adjacent metal frames from two different levels" (col. 1, Ins. 50-52). Additionally, the device is connected by conventional fasteners, such as bolt 8 shown in the Figure (col. 3, Ins. 5-6). Thus, Mangal fails to teach or suggest building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion.

In Figures 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of Newcomb, the Examiner points to a seismic facade support. However, the facade support in Newcomb is composed of a variety of metallic parts, such as angle iron 28 and aluminum hinge pin 32 (col. 3, Ins. 10-12 and 21-24). Additionally, the facade support is connected by conventional fasteners, such as threaded pins 102 and machine screws 114 and 116 shown in Figure 4 (col. 5, Ins. 53-54 and 66-67). Thus, Newcomb fails to teach or suggest building components extruded from a polymer material that slide or snap into interlocking engagement configured to accommodate limited rotational and translational motion.

For at least the above reasons, new claims 27-52 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Please contact applicant's attorney if there are any additional issues to address.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on October 13, 2004.

Pamela A. Knight

Date of Signature: October 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.


Pierre C. Van Rysselberghe
Registration No. 33,557
Customer PTO No. 23581
200 Pacific Building
520 SW Yamhill Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679